arXiv:1209.1014v1 [quant-ph] 5 Sep 2012

Quantum-correlation breaking channels, quantum conditional probability and Perron-Frobenius theory

Dariusz Chruściński
Institute of Physics, Nicolaus Copernicus University
Grudziądzka 5/7, 87–100 Toruń, Poland

Using the quantum analog of conditional probability and classical Bayes theorem we discuss some aspects of quantum-classical and classical-classical channels in connection to the recent paper J. Korbicz, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, *Quantum-correlation breaking channels, broadcasting scenarios, and finite Markov chains*, arXiv:1208.2162v2. Applying the quantum analog of Perron-Frobenius theorem we generalize the result of Korbicz et. al. on full and spectrum broadcasting from quantum-classical channels to arbitrary channels.

PACS numbers: 03.67.Hk, 03.67.-a

I. INTRODUCTION

In a recent paper [1] authors provided an interesting refinement of the characterization of entanglement breaking channels from Ref. [2] to more general quantum correlations and connected it to measurement maps, quantum state broadcasting, and finite Markov chains.

In this report we show that a natural framework to discuss this characterization is the notion of *quantum conditional probability* [3] (see also [4]) [or *conditional quantum states* [5, 6]. Slightly different approach was also proposed in Ref. [7]]. Conditional probability plays important role in classical probability theory. Having two random variables A and B one introduces conditional probability (for B given A) $p_{i|j} = P(B = i|A = j)$ which satisfies:

$$p_{i|j} \geq 0 \ ; \quad \sum_i p_{i|j} = 1 \ . \tag{1}$$

Knowing probability distribution p^A_j for A one has for the joint probability $p_{ij} = P(B = i, A = j)$

$$p_{ij} = p_{i|j}\, p^A_j \ , \tag{2}$$

and hence the marginal probability for B reads

$$p^B_i = \sum_j p_{ij} = \sum_j p_{i|j}\, p^A_j \ . \tag{3}$$

The above formula defines a classical channel $\mathbf{p}^B = T\mathbf{p}^A$, where the stochastic matrix T is defined by $T_{ij} = p_{i|j}$. It is therefore clear that notions of a classical channel and a classical conditional probability coincide:

classical channel $\longleftrightarrow$ classical conditional probability.

This correspondence suggests that one may introduce the concept of quantum conditional probability using well defined notion of a quantum channel, that is, completely positive trace preserving map (CPTP). Due to the Choi-Jamiołkowski isomorphism [8] the space of linear maps $\Lambda_{B|A} : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_A) \longrightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_B)$ is isomorphic to $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B)$: if $|i\rangle_A$ denote an orthonormal (computational) basis in $\mathcal{H}_A$ and $|\widetilde{\psi}^+_{AA}\rangle = \sum_i |ii\rangle_A$ stands for (unnormalized) maximally entangled vector in $\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_A$, then one introduces

$$\pi_{B|A} = (\mathbb{1}_A \otimes \Lambda_{B|A})\widetilde{P}^+_{AA} \ , \tag{4}$$

where $\widetilde{P}^+_{AA} = |\widetilde{\psi}^+_{AA}\rangle\langle\widetilde{\psi}^+_{AA}|$. Suppose that $\Lambda_{B|A}$ is CPTP. Complete positivity implies that $\pi_{B|A} \geq 0$. Moreover, one has

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{Tr}_B\, \pi_{B|A} &= \mathrm{Tr}_B \sum_{i,j} |i\rangle_A\langle j| \otimes \Lambda_{B|A}(|i\rangle_A\langle j|) \\
&= \sum_{i,j} |i\rangle_A\langle j|\, \mathrm{Tr}[\Lambda_{B|A}(|i\rangle_A\langle j|)] \\
&= \sum_{i,j} |i\rangle_A\langle j|\, \mathrm{Tr}(|i\rangle_A\langle j|) = \sum_i |i\rangle_A\langle i| = \mathbb{I}_A \ ,
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used $\mathrm{Tr}[\Lambda_{B|A}(\rho)] = \mathrm{Tr}\rho$. Following [3, 5] let us introduce

Definition 1. We call $\pi_{B|A} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B)$ a *quantum conditional probability* iff

$$\pi_{B|A} \geq 0 \ ; \quad \mathrm{Tr}_B\, \pi_{B|A} = \mathbb{I}_A \ . \tag{5}$$

In [5] $\pi_{B|A}$ is called *conditional quantum state*. Note, that (5) is a quantum analog of (1). It is therefore clear that formula (4) establishes isomorphism

quantum channel $\longleftrightarrow$ quantum conditional probability.

Remark 1. *It is often said that formula (4) establishes isomorphism between quantum channels and quantum states. It is of course not true. Note that*

$$\rho_{AB} = \frac{1}{d_A}\, (\mathbb{1}_A \otimes \Lambda_{B|A})\widetilde{P}^+_{AA} \ , \tag{6}$$

defines a legitimate state ρ_{AB} *in* $\mathcal{H}_{AB}$. *However, the inverse map*

$$\Lambda_{B|A}(\rho) = d_A\, \mathrm{Tr}_A[\rho_{AB} \cdot (\rho^T \otimes \mathbb{I}_B)] \ , \tag{7}$$

is not trace preserving unless $\mathrm{Tr}_B\, \rho_{AB} = \mathbb{I}_A/d_A$*, i.e. its marginal state* ρ_A *is maximally mixed. In this case* $\pi_{B|A} = d_A \rho_{AB}$ *defines quantum conditional probability.*

Note, that formula (7) rewritten in terms of $\pi_{B|A}$

$$\Lambda_{B|A}(\rho) = \mathrm{Tr}_A[\pi_{B|A} \cdot (\rho^T \otimes \mathbb{I}_B)] \ , \tag{8}$$

defines a quantum analog of (3). The transposition ρ^T is performed with respect to the computational basis $|i\rangle_A$ in $\mathcal{H}_A$. One has

$$\mathrm{Tr}_A[\pi_{B|A} \cdot (\rho \otimes \mathbb{I}_B)] = \mathrm{Tr}_A[(\rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \otimes \mathbb{I}_B)\, \pi_{B|A}\, (\rho^{\frac{1}{2}} \otimes \mathbb{I}_B)] \ ,$$

and hence a natural way to generalize (2) is to define a compound state ρ_{AB} by the following symmetric prescription

$$\rho_{AB} = (\rho_A^{\frac{1}{2}} \otimes \mathbb{I}_B)\, \pi_{B|A}\, (\rho_A^{\frac{1}{2}} \otimes \mathbb{I}_B) \ , \tag{9}$$

where ρ_A is a state in $\mathcal{H}_A$. Note, that by construction $\mathrm{Tr}_B\, \rho_{AB}$ recovers ρ_A. Moreover

$$\rho_B = \mathrm{Tr}_A\, \rho_{AB} = \Lambda_{B|A}(\rho_A^T) \ . \tag{10}$$

II. QUANTUM-CORRELATION BREAKING CHANNELS

Let us recall that an entanglement breaking channel [2] has the following well known Holevo representation

$$\Lambda_{B|A}(\rho) = \sum_i \mathrm{Tr}(\rho F_i)\, R_i \ , \tag{11}$$

where F_i stands for POVM in $\mathcal{H}_A$, and $R_i \geq 0$ together with $\mathrm{Tr} R_i = 1$. The corresponding conditional state

$$\pi_{B|A} = \sum_i F_i^T \otimes R_i \ , \tag{12}$$

is a separable positive operator in $\mathcal{H}_{AB}$. One has

$$\mathrm{Tr}_B\, \pi_{B|A} = \sum_i F_i^T = \mathbb{I}_A \ , \tag{13}$$

by the very property of POVM. Now, a quantum conditional probability operator $\pi_{B|A}$ is quantum-classical (QC) [or more presicely $Q_A B_C$] if R_i mutually commute and hence there exists an orthonormal basis $|f_i\rangle$ in $\mathcal{H}_B$ such that

$$R_i = \sum_j p_{j|i} |f_j\rangle\langle f_j| \ , \tag{14}$$

where $p_{j|i}$ defines a classical conditional probability. Indeed, R_i is trivially positive and $\mathrm{Tr}\, R_i = 1$ due to $\sum_j p_{j|i} = 1$. Therefore, one has the following formula for QC conditional state

$$\pi_{B|A} = \sum_{i,j} p_{j|i} F_i^T \otimes |f_j\rangle\langle f_j| \ , \tag{15}$$

and for the corresponding channel (quantum-to-classical measurement map [9])

$$\Lambda_{B|A}(\rho) = \sum_i p_{j|i}\, \mathrm{Tr}(\rho F_i)\, |f_j\rangle\langle f_j| \ . \tag{16}$$

Hence the output state reads as follows

$$\Lambda_{B|A}(\rho) = \sum_j p_j |f_j\rangle\langle f_j| \ , \tag{17}$$

where

$$p_j = \sum_i p_{j|i} q_i \ , \tag{18}$$

with $q_i = \mathrm{Tr}(F_i \rho)$.

Remark 2. *It shows that conditional probability* $p_{i|j}$ *appears already on the level of QC channels.*

A conditional state $\pi_{B|A}$ is called CQ [or more precisely $C_A Q_B$] iff F_i mutually commute, that is, there exists an orthonormal basis $|e_i\rangle$ in $\mathcal{H}_A$ such that

$$F_i = \sum_k q_{i|k} |e_k\rangle\langle e_k| \ , \tag{19}$$

where $q_{i|k}$ stands for conditional probability. Hence, one has for CQ conditional state

$$\pi_{B|A} = \sum_{i,j} q_{i|j}\, |e_j^*\rangle\langle e_j^*| \otimes R_i \ , \tag{20}$$

and for the corresponding channel

$$\Lambda_{B|A}(\rho) = \sum_{i,j} q_{j|i}\, \langle e_i|\rho|e_i\rangle\, R_j \ . \tag{21}$$

Finally, $\pi_{B|A}$ is classical-classical (CC) if it is QC and CQ and hence

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_{B|A} &= \sum_{i,j,k} p_{k|i}\, q_{i|j}\, |e_j^*\rangle\langle e_j^*| \otimes |f_k\rangle\langle f_k| \\ &= \sum_{j,k} \pi_{k|j}\, |e_j^*\rangle\langle e_j^*| \otimes |f_k\rangle\langle f_k| \ , \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

where we have used

$$\pi_{k|j} = \sum_i p_{k|i}\, q_{i|j} \ .$$

It is clear that $\pi_{k|j}$ defines a legitimate conditional probability. The corresponding CC channel reads as follows

$$\Lambda_{B|A}(\rho) = \sum_{j,k} \pi_{k|j} \langle e_j|\rho|e_j\rangle\, |f_k\rangle\langle f_k| \ . \tag{23}$$

Remark 3. *Let* $\Lambda : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_A) \to \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_B)$ *be a linear map (not necessarily completely positive) and let*

$$\Lambda \ \longrightarrow \ \sum_{i,j} |i\rangle_A\langle j| \otimes \Lambda(|i\rangle_A\langle j|) \ , \tag{24}$$

denote the standard Choi-Jamiolkowski isomorphism. Define a dual map $\Lambda^\# : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_B) \to \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_A)$ *via*

$$\mathrm{Tr}[\Lambda^\#(a) \cdot \rho] = \mathrm{Tr}[a \cdot \Lambda(\rho)] \ .$$

For the dual map it is convenient to use the above isomorphism in the following "dual" convention

$$\Lambda^\# \ \longrightarrow \ \sum_{k,l} \Lambda^\#(|k\rangle_B\langle l|) \otimes |k\rangle_B\langle l| \ ,$$

since both (24) and (3) give rise to bi-partite operators in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B)$*. Note, that* $\sum_{k,l} |k\rangle_B\langle l| \otimes \Lambda^\#(|k\rangle_B\langle l|) \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_B \otimes \mathcal{H}_A)$*.*

Let $\Lambda_{B|A}$ be a quantum channel. Its dual is not trace preserving unless $\Lambda_{B|A}$ is unital, i.e. $\Lambda_{B|A}(\mathbb{I}_A) = \mathbb{I}_B$. Suppose that $\Lambda_{B|A}(\mathbb{I}_A) = V > 0$ and define

$$\widetilde{\Lambda}_{B|A}(\rho) = V^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Lambda_{B|A}(\rho) V^{-\frac{1}{2}} \ . \tag{25}$$

Clearly, $\widetilde{\Lambda}_{B|A}$ is unital and hence its dual defines a quantum channel. Therefore, with each channel $\Lambda_{B|A}$, satisfying $\Lambda_{B|A}(\mathbb{I}_A) > 0$, we may associate a channel $\Lambda_{A|B} = \widetilde{\Lambda}^\#_{B|A}$ by

$$\Lambda_{A|B}(\sigma) = \Lambda^\#_{B|A}(V^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sigma V^{-\frac{1}{2}}) \ . \tag{26}$$

Interestingly $\Lambda_{A|B}(V) = \mathbb{I}_A$. One has the following

Theorem 1. *$\Lambda_{B|A}$ is $Q_A C_B$ iff $\Lambda_{A|B}$ is $C_B Q_A$.*

Proof: consider a $Q_A C_B$ channel defined in (16). One has

$$V = \Lambda_{B|A}(\mathbb{I}_A) = \sum_{i,j} p_{j|i}\, x_i |f_j\rangle\langle f_j| \ , \tag{27}$$

with $x_i = \mathrm{Tr}\, F_i$, and assume that $p_j = \sum_i p_{j|i} x_i > 0$ for all $j = 1, \ldots, d_B$. One obtains the following channel

$$\Lambda_{A|B}(\sigma) = \sum_{i,j} \frac{p_{j|i}}{p_j}\, \langle f_j|\rho|f_j\rangle\, F_i \ , \tag{28}$$

where $\sigma \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_B)$. Now, the classical Bayes theorem implies

$$p_{i|j} p_j = p_{j|i} x_i \ ,$$

and hence $\Lambda_{A|B}$ has a correct $C_B Q_A$ structure

$$\Lambda_{A|B}(\sigma) = \sum_{i,j} p_{i|j}\, \langle f_j|\rho|f_j\rangle\, R_i \ , \tag{29}$$

where $R_i = F_i / x_i$ is a density operator in $\mathcal{H}_A$. □

It is clear that any channel $\Lambda_{A|B} : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_B) \longrightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_A)$ gives rise to a quantum conditional probability

$$\pi_{A|B} = (\Lambda_{A|B} \otimes \mathbb{1}_B) \widetilde{P}^+_{BB} \ , \tag{30}$$

and the inverse map reads

$$\Lambda_{A|B}(\sigma) = \mathrm{Tr}_B[\pi^{T_B}_{A|B}(\mathbb{I}_A \otimes \sigma)] \ . \tag{31}$$

It should be clear that a concept of quantum conditional probability leads immediately to an analog of the Bayes theorem: let ρ_{AB} be a bi-partite state in $\mathcal{H}_{AB}$ with reduces (marginal) states

$$\rho_A = \mathrm{Tr}_B\, \rho_{AB} \ , \quad \rho_B = \mathrm{Tr}_A\, \rho_{AB} \ ,$$

satisfying $\rho_A > 0$ and $\rho_B > 0$, that is, both reduces density operators are faithful. Let us introduce two quantum conditional probabilities

$$\pi_{B|A} = (\rho_A^{-\frac{1}{2}} \otimes \mathbb{I}_B)\, \rho_{AB}\, (\rho_A^{-\frac{1}{2}} \otimes \mathbb{I}_B) \ , \tag{32}$$

and

$$\pi_{A|B} = (\mathbb{I}_A \otimes \rho_B^{-\frac{1}{2}})\, \rho_{AB}\, (\mathbb{I}_A \otimes \rho_B^{-\frac{1}{2}}) \ . \tag{33}$$

Therefore, by construction, one may formulate the quantum analog of Bayes theorem

$$(\rho_A^{\frac{1}{2}} \otimes \mathbb{I}_B)\, \pi_{B|A}\, (\rho_A^{\frac{1}{2}} \otimes \mathbb{I}_B) = (\mathbb{I}_A \otimes \rho_B^{\frac{1}{2}})\, \pi_{A|B}\, (\mathbb{I}_A \otimes \rho_B^{\frac{1}{2}}) \ .$$

In particular

$$\pi_{A|B} = (\rho_A^{\frac{1}{2}} \otimes \rho_B^{-\frac{1}{2}})\, \pi_{B|A}\, (\rho_A^{\frac{1}{2}} \otimes \rho_B^{-\frac{1}{2}}) \ , \tag{34}$$

and if $\Lambda_{B|A}$ and $\Lambda_{A|B}$ denotes the corresponding quantum channels one easily finds the following relation

$$\Lambda_{A|B}(\sigma) = \rho_A^{\frac{1}{2}} \Big[\Lambda_{B|A} \left(\rho_B^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sigma^T \rho_B^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right) \Big]^T \rho_A^{\frac{1}{2}} \ , \tag{35}$$

where $\sigma \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_B)$. Note that

$$\Lambda_{B|A}(\rho_A) = \rho_B^T \ , \quad \Lambda_{A|B}(\rho_B) = \rho_A^T \ .$$

In analogy to Theorem 1 one proves

Theorem 2. *For any faithful ρ_A and ρ_B a channel $\Lambda_{B|A}$ is $Q_A C_B$ iff $\Lambda_{A|B}$ is $C_B Q_A$. Equivalently, $\pi_{B|A}$ is $Q_A C_B$ iff $\pi_{A|B}$ is $C_B Q_A$.*

Hence

Corollary 1. *For any faithful ρ_A and ρ_B a channel $\Lambda_{B|A}$ is CC iff $\Lambda_{A|B}$ is CC. Equivalently, $\pi_{B|A}$ is CC iff $\pi_{A|B}$ is CC.*

Now, we reformulate the main result of [1] in terms of quantum conditional probability.

Theorem 3. *Let $\Lambda_{B|A}$ be a quantum channel. The corresponding quantum conditional probability $\pi_{B|A} = (\mathbb{1}_A \otimes \Lambda_{B|A}) \widetilde{P}^+_{AA}$ is $Q_A C_B$ if and only if $(\mathbb{1}_C \otimes \Lambda_{B|A}) \rho_{CA}$ is a $Q_C C_B$ state in $\mathcal{H}_{CB}$ for any bipartite state ρ_{CA} in $\mathcal{H}_{CA}$.*

Proof: suppose that $\pi_{B|A}$ is $Q_A C_B$, that is,

$$\Lambda_{B|A}(\rho) = \sum_{i,j} p_{j|i} \, \mathrm{Tr}(\rho F_i) \, |f_j\rangle\langle f_j| \ . \tag{36}$$

Let

$$\rho_{CA} = \sum_{i,j} \rho_{ij} \otimes |i\rangle_A \langle j| \ , \tag{37}$$

with $\rho_{ij} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_C)$. One has

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbb{1}_C \otimes \Lambda_{B|A})\rho_{CA} &= \sum_{i,j} \rho_{ij} \otimes \Lambda_{B|A}(|i\rangle\langle j|) \\ &= \sum_{i,j} \sum_{k,l} p_{k|l} \, \rho_{ij} \otimes \mathrm{Tr}(F_l |i\rangle_A \langle j|) |f_k\rangle\langle f_k| \\ &= \sum_{k,l} p_{k|l} \, \sigma_l \otimes |f_k\rangle\langle f_k| \ , \end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

where

$$\sigma_l = \sum_{i,j} \rho_{ij} \langle j|F_l|i\rangle \ , \tag{39}$$

defines a set of positive operators in $\mathcal{H}_C$. Let $p_l = \mathrm{Tr}\, \sigma_l$ and let $p_{kl} = p_{k|l} p_l$. One has

$$(\mathbb{1}_C \otimes \Lambda_{B|A})\rho_{CA} = \sum_{k,l} p_{kl} \, \rho_l \otimes |f_k\rangle\langle f_k| \ , \tag{40}$$

where $\rho_l = \sigma_l / p_l$ are density operators in $\mathcal{H}_C$. □

Remark 4. *The positivity of σ_l is not very clear from (39). Note, that*

$$(\mathbb{I}_C \otimes F_l^{\frac{1}{2}}) \, \rho_{CA} \, (\mathbb{I}_C \otimes F_l^{\frac{1}{2}}) = \sum_{i,j} \rho_{ij} \otimes F_l^{\frac{1}{2}} |i\rangle\langle j| F_l^{\frac{1}{2}} \ ,$$

is evidently positive. Hence

$$\mathrm{Tr}_A[(\mathbb{I}_C \otimes F_l^{\frac{1}{2}}) \, \rho_{CA} \, (\mathbb{I}_C \otimes F_l^{\frac{1}{2}})] = \sum_{i,j} \rho_{ij} \langle j|F_l|i\rangle \ ,$$

is positive as well. Moreover $p_l = \mathrm{Tr}\sigma_l \leq 1$.

Let $\Lambda_{B|A}$ be CC. As was shown in [1] it is not true that $(\mathbb{1}_C \otimes \Lambda_{B|A})\rho_{CA}$ is CC for arbitrary ρ_{CA}. Following [1] denote by $CC(\Lambda_{B|A})$ a set of states in $\mathcal{H}_{CA}$ such that $(\mathbb{1}_C \otimes \Lambda_{B|A})\rho_{CA}$ is $C_C C_B$.

Theorem 4. *Let $\Lambda_{B|A}$ be CC*

$$\Lambda_{B|A}(\rho) = \sum_{i,j} \pi_{j|i} \, \langle e_i|\rho|e_i\rangle \, |f_j\rangle\langle f_j| \ . \tag{41}$$

A state $(\mathbb{1}_C \otimes \Lambda_{B|A})\rho_{CA}$ in $\mathcal{H}_{CB}$ is CC iff the diagonal blocks ρ_{ii} of the following representation

$$\rho_{CA} = \sum_{i,j} \rho_{ij} \otimes |e_i\rangle\langle e_j| \ , \tag{42}$$

mutually commute.

Proof: one has

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbb{1}_C \otimes \Lambda_{B|A})\rho_{CA} &= \sum_{i,j} \rho_{ij} \otimes \Lambda_{B|A}(|e_i\rangle\langle e_j|) \\ &= \sum_{i,j} \sum_{k,l} \pi_{k|l} \, \rho_{ij} \otimes \langle e_l|e_i\rangle\langle e_j|e_l\rangle |f_k\rangle\langle f_k| \\ &= \sum_{k,l} \pi_{k|l} \, \rho_{ll} \otimes |f_k\rangle\langle f_k| \ , \end{aligned} \tag{43}$$

which is CC iff $[\rho_{ll}, \rho_{kk}] = 0$. □

Hence, ρ_{CA} has the following form

$$\rho_{CA} = \sigma'_{CA} + \sigma''_{CA} \ , \tag{44}$$

where

$$\sigma'_{CA} = \sum_{i,j} \tau_{ji} \, |c_i\rangle\langle c_i| \otimes |e_j\rangle\langle e_j| \ , \tag{45}$$

is a CC state ($|c_i\rangle$ stands for the orthonormal basis in $\mathcal{H}_C$), and

$$\sigma''_{CA} = \sum_{i \neq j} \rho_{ij} \otimes |e_i\rangle\langle e_j| \ . \tag{46}$$

The off-diagonal part σ''_{CA} is arbitrary provided $\rho_{CA} \geq 0$. The channel (41) acting upon ρ_{CA} kills σ''_{CA} and transforms CC part σ'_{CA} into

$$(\mathbb{1}_C \otimes \Lambda_{B|A})\sigma''_{CA} = \sum_{j,k} \kappa_{jk} \, |c_k\rangle\langle c_k| \otimes |f_j\rangle\langle f_j| \ ,$$

where $\kappa_{jk} = \sum_i \pi_{j|i} \, \tau_{ik}$ is a legitimate joint probability distribution.

Let $P_i = |e_i\rangle\langle e_i|$. Define a CPTP projector

$$\mathcal{P}_A(\rho_A) = \sum_i P_i \rho_A P_i \ .$$

Corollary 2. *A state $\rho_{CA} \in CC(\Lambda_{B|A})$ iff $[\mathbb{1}_C \otimes \mathcal{P}_A](\rho_{CA})$ is $C_C C_A$.*

This result may be reformulated in terms of partial decoherence. Let

$$L = \gamma(\mathbb{1}_A - \mathcal{P}_A) \ ,$$

denotes a genuine generator of Markovian semigroup in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_A)$. One finds for the corresponding dynamical map $\Phi_t^A = e^{tL}$:

$$\rho_t = \Phi_t^A(\rho) = e^{-\gamma t}\rho + (1 - e^{-\gamma t})\mathcal{P}_A(\rho) \ ,$$

and hence the asymptotic state

$$\rho_\infty = \mathcal{P}_A(\rho) \ ,$$

is perfectly decohered with respect to $|e_i\rangle$ basis in $\mathcal{H}_A$. Consider now the following partial decoherence in $\mathcal{H}_{CA}$

$$\Phi_t^{CA} = \mathbb{1}_C \otimes \Phi_t^A \ .$$

It is clear that $\rho_{CA} \in CC(\Lambda_{B|A})$ iff the partially decohered asymptotic state $\Phi_\infty^{CA}(\rho_{CA})$ is $C_C C_A$.

III. QUANTUM PERRON-FROBENIUS THEOREM AND BROADCASTABILITY OF QUANTUM STATES

Authors of [1] found an interesting connection between broadcastability of quantum states by QC channels and celebrated Perron-Frobenius theory. In this section we are going to explore this connection further. It turns out that considering arbitrary channels (not necessarily QC ones) we need to consider the quantum analog of Perron-Frobenius theory [10, 11].

Let $\mathcal{H}_A = \mathcal{H}_B = \mathcal{H}$. A state ρ_* in $\mathcal{H}$ is braodcastable by the channel Λ if the corresponding compound state

$$\rho_{AB} = (\rho_*^{\frac{1}{2}} \otimes \mathbb{I}_B)\, \pi_{B|A}\, (\rho_*^{\frac{1}{2}} \otimes \mathbb{I}_B)\ , \tag{47}$$

provides a broadcast for ρ_A, that is, $\rho_A = \rho_B = \rho_*$. It is clear that by construction $\rho_A = \rho_*$ and $\rho_B = \Lambda_{B|A}(\rho_*^T)$.

Corollary 3. *A state ρ_* is broadcastable by the channel Λ iff*

$$\Lambda^\tau(\rho_*) = \rho_*\ , \tag{48}$$

that is, ρ_* is a fixed point of the positive trace preserving map $\Lambda^\tau = \Lambda \circ T$, where again T denotes transposition with respect to the computational basis in $\mathcal{H}_A$.

Let $\Phi : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \to \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ be a positive trace-preserving map (not necessarily completely positive). One proves [10, 11] that Φ possesses an eigenvalue $\lambda_* = 1$ and the corresponding (in general not unique) eigenvector ρ_* (after suitable normalization) defines a legitimate density operator in $\mathcal{H}$. Moreover, the remaining (in general complex) eigenvalues λ_α satisfy $|\lambda_\alpha| \leq |\lambda_*| = 1$. To guarantee the uniqueness of ρ_* one needs extra conditions upon Φ. The quantum analog of irreducibility reads as follows: Φ is irreducible iff $(\mathbb{1} + \Lambda)^{n-1}(\rho) > 0$ for all $\rho \geq 0$ and $n = \dim \mathcal{H}$. If Φ is irreducible then ρ_* is unique. Finally, let us call Φ *primitive* (or *regular*) iff for some integer k one has $\Phi^k(A) > 0$ for all $A \geq 0$. If Φ is primitive then clearly the Perron-Frobenius vector ρ_* is unique and moreover the remaining eigenvalues λ_α satisfy $|\lambda_\alpha| < |\lambda_*| = 1$.

Corollary 4. *For an arbitrary quantum channel Λ there exists a state ρ_* (Perron-Frobenius eigenvector of Λ^τ) which is broadcastable by Λ.*

Let us consider the spectral problem for Λ^τ and its dual $\Lambda^{\tau\#}$:

$$\Lambda^\tau(X_\alpha) = \lambda_\alpha X_\alpha\ , \quad \Lambda^{\tau\#}(Y_\alpha) = \lambda_\alpha^* Y_\alpha\ , \tag{49}$$

with $\alpha = 0, 1, \ldots, d^2 - 1$ ($d = \dim \mathcal{H}$). The so called damping basis [12] satisfies $\mathrm{Tr}(X_\alpha Y_\beta^\dagger) = \delta_{\alpha\beta}$. One has $\lambda_0 = 1$, $X_0 = \rho_*$ and $Y_0 = \mathbb{I}$. Moreover, $\mathrm{Tr}\, X_\alpha = 0$ for all $\alpha > 0$. The action of Λ^τ may be, therefore , represented as follows

$$\Lambda^\tau(\rho)\ =\ \sum_{\alpha=0}^{d^2-1} \lambda_\alpha X_\alpha \mathrm{Tr}(Y_\alpha^\dagger \rho) = \rho_* \mathrm{Tr}\,\rho + \xi(\rho)\ , \tag{50}$$

where the traceless operator $\xi(\rho)$ reads

$$\xi = \sum_{\alpha>0} \lambda_\alpha X_\alpha \mathrm{Tr}(Y_\alpha^\dagger \rho)\ .$$

Equivalently, the original channel Λ acts as follows

$$\Lambda(\rho) = \sum_{\alpha=0}^{d^2-1} \lambda_\alpha X_\alpha \mathrm{Tr}(Y_\alpha^\dagger \rho^T) = \rho_* \mathrm{Tr}\,\rho + \xi^\tau(\rho)\ ,$$

with the traceless $\xi^\tau(\rho) = \sum_{\alpha>0}^{d^2-1} \lambda_\alpha X_\alpha \mathrm{Tr}(Y_\alpha^\dagger \rho^T)$.

The corresponding quantum conditional probability is given by the following formula

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_{B|A}\ &=\ \sum_{i,j} |i\rangle_A\langle j| \otimes \Lambda(|i\rangle_A\langle j|) = \sum_{\alpha=0}^{d^2-1} \lambda_\alpha Y_\alpha^\dagger \otimes X_\alpha \\ &=\ \mathbb{I}_A \otimes \rho_* + \sum_{\alpha>0} \lambda_\alpha Y_\alpha^\dagger \otimes X_\alpha\ . \end{aligned} \tag{51}$$

One clearly sees that $\mathrm{Tr}_B \pi_{B|A} = \mathbb{I}_A$ due to the normalization $\mathrm{Tr}\rho_* = 1$ and $\mathrm{Tr}\, X_\alpha = 0$ for $\alpha > 0$. On the other hand one has $\mathrm{Tr}_A \pi_{B|A} = \sum_\alpha \lambda_\alpha \mathrm{Tr}(Y_\alpha^\dagger)\, X_\alpha = \Lambda(\mathbb{I}_A)$. Hence, if Λ is unital, then $\mathrm{Tr}_A \pi_{B|A} = \mathbb{I}_B$. The compound ρ_{AB} state is given by

$$\rho_{AB} = (\rho_*^{\frac{1}{2}} \otimes \mathbb{I}_B) \pi_{B|A} (\rho_*^{\frac{1}{2}} \otimes \mathbb{I}_B) = \rho_* \otimes \rho_* + \zeta_{AB}\ , \tag{52}$$

with

$$\zeta_{AB} = \sum_{\alpha>0} \lambda_\alpha\, \rho_*^{\frac{1}{2}}\, Y_\alpha^\dagger \rho_*^{\frac{1}{2}} \otimes X_\alpha\ . \tag{53}$$

Note, that $\mathrm{Tr}_A \zeta_{AB} = \mathrm{Tr}_B \zeta_{AB} = 0$. The formula (52) may be therefore considered as the canonical representation of the broadcast for ρ_*.

Corollary 5. *A compound state ρ_{AB} is a broadcast for ρ_* iff*

$$\zeta_{AB} = \rho_{AB} - \rho_* \otimes \rho_*\ ,$$

satisfies $\mathrm{Tr}_A \zeta_{AB} = \mathrm{Tr}_B \zeta_{AB} = 0$.

Authors of [1] introduced a notion of spectrum broadcastability: $\widetilde{\rho}_*$ is spectrum broadcastable by Λ if there exists unitary U such that

$$\rho_B = U \widetilde{\rho}_* U^\dagger\ , \tag{54}$$

that is, ρ_B has the same spectrum as $\widetilde{\rho}_*$ (again $\rho_A = \widetilde{\rho}_*$).

Let U be an arbitrary unitary operator in $\mathcal{H}$. Denote by Λ_U^τ the following positive and trace preserving map

$$\Lambda_U^\tau(\rho) = U^* \Lambda(\rho^T) U^T\ . \tag{55}$$

Let ρ_*^U be the corresponding Perron-Frobenius eigenvector, that is,

$$\Lambda_U^\tau(\rho_*^U) = \rho_*^U\ . \tag{56}$$

Proposition 1. *The state ρ_*^U is spectrum broadcastable by Λ.*

Proof: one has

$$\begin{aligned}\rho^U_{AB} &= (\rho_*^{U\,\frac{1}{2}} \otimes \mathbb{I}_B)\pi_{B|A}(\rho_*^{U\,\frac{1}{2}} \otimes \mathbb{I}_B) \\ &= \rho_*^U \otimes \rho_* + \zeta^U_{AB}\ , \end{aligned} \tag{57}$$

with

$$\zeta^U_{AB} = \sum_{\alpha>0} \lambda_\alpha\, \rho_*^{U\,\frac{1}{2}}\, Y_\alpha^\dagger \rho_*^{U\,\frac{1}{2}} \otimes X_\alpha\ . \tag{58}$$

This gives

$$\rho_A = \rho_*^U\ , \quad \rho_B = \Lambda^\tau(\rho_*^U) = U\rho_*^U U^\dagger\ ,$$

which proves spectrum broadcastability. □

Note, that if Λ^τ is a primitive map, i.e. ρ_* is unique and $|\lambda_\alpha| < |\lambda_0| = 1$ for $\alpha > 0$, then there exists a limit

$$\lim_{r\to\infty} \Lambda^r = \Lambda_\infty\ , \tag{59}$$

defined by $\Lambda_\infty(\rho) = \rho_* \mathrm{Tr}\rho$. In this case Λ_∞ breaks all correlations present in an arbitrary state $(\Lambda \otimes \mathbb{1}_B)\rho_{AB} = \rho_* \otimes \rho_B$ with $\rho_B = \mathrm{Tr}\rho_{AB}$. Again this result holds for an arbitrary channel Λ (not necessarily QC one [1]).

IV. CONCLUSIONS

We provided characterization of correlation breaking channels in terms of quantum conditional probability (or quantum conditional states). Using the quantum analog of Bayes theorem which relates $\pi_{B|A}$ and $\pi_{A|B}$ it was shown that any Q_AC_B channel $\Lambda_{B|A}$ gives rise to the whole family on C_BQ_A channels $\Lambda_{A|B}$. All these channels enjoy the following property: if $\rho_B = \Lambda_{B|A}(\rho_A)$, then $\rho_A = \Lambda_{A|B}(\rho_B)$. Interestingly, these channels corresponds to the Barnum-Knill recovery channels [13], that is, $\Lambda_{A|B}$ recovers 'quantum' ρ_A out of the 'classical' ρ_B.

Finally, using the quantum analog of celebrated Perron-Frobenius theorem we provided generalization of results of Korbicz et. al. [1] from QC channels to arbitrary quantum channels. A quantum channel Λ may be used to broadcast the Perron-Frobenius eigenvector of $\Lambda^\tau = \Lambda \circ T$. Moreover, there exists a whole family of states spectrum broadcastable by Λ : for each unitary operator U the corresponding Perron-Frobenius eigenvector of Λ_U^τ is spectrum broadcastable by the original channel Λ.

To summarize: there exist an intriguing connections between quantum analogs of conditional probability, Bayes theorem and Perron-Frobenius theorem. We believe that these connections deserve further analysis.

Acknowledgments

This work was partially supported by the National Science Centre project 2011/03/B/ST2/00136.

---

[1] J. Korbicz, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, *Quantum-correlation breaking channels, broadcasting scenarios, and finite Markov chains*, arXiv:1208.2162v2.
[2] M. Horodecki, P.W. Shor, and M. B. Ruskai, Rev. Math. Phys **15**, 629 (2003).
[3] M. Asorey, A. Kossakowski, G. Marmo, and E. C. G. Sudarshan, Open Syst. Inf. Dyn. **12**, 319 (2005).
[4] Y. Hirota, D. Chruściński, T. Matsuoka, and M. Ohya, arXiv:1109.3438v1.
[5] M. S. Leifer, Phys. Rev. A **74**, 042310 (2006).
[6] M. S. Leifer, R. W. Spekkens, *Formulating Quantum Theory as a Causally Neutral Theory of Bayesian Inference*, arXiv:1107.5849v2.
[7] N. J. Cerf and C. Adami, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 5194 (1997).
[8] A. Jamiołkowski, Rep. Math. Phys. **3**, 275 (1972); M.-D. Choi, Linear Algebra Appl. **10**, 285 (1975).
[9] M. Piani, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, Phys. Rev. Lett. 100, 090502 (2008).
[10] S. Albeverio and R. Høegh-Krohn, Commun. Math. Phys. **64**, 83 (1978).
[11] D. Evans and R. Høegh-Krohn, J. London Math. Soc. **17**, 345 (1978).
[12] H.-J. Briegel and B. G. Englert, Phys. Rev. A **47**, 3311 (1993).
[13] H. Barnum and E. Knill, J. Math. Phys. **43**, 2097 (2002).